

55



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,353	06/23/2003	Khachatur Papanyan	DC-05118	1252
33438	7590	12/22/2005	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP			GORTAYO, DANGELINO N	
P.O. BOX 203518			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78720			2168	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,353	PAPANYAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dangelino N. Gortayo	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/24/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

OK

OZ

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the specification: reference 400 for an information handling system from page 9 line 22 and reference 412 for a bus from page 10 line 3. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 7 recites the limitation "a web page" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear as to what web page is being referred to, and renders the scope of the claim indeterminate. For purposes of examination, "a web page" is assumed to be any web page currently in the web cache.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parrella et al. (Parrella, US Publication 2003/0078964).

6. As per claim 1, Parrella teaches "receiving a request from a client for a web page" (block 44 lines 3-20) "comparing the requested web page to a list of cached web pages corresponding to cached web pages stored on a web server" (block 62 wherein the "Super CO Server" is a bridge between the user and a database server and holds a cache holding web pages, and performs the same functions as a "web server") "determining whether a current version of the requested web page is stored on said web

server" (block 62 wherein the Super Co Server "requests updated copies of the changed web pages" is an analogous step) "returning the current version of the web page to the client" (block 44 wherein "the web page then proceeds back to browser" conveys the same step of returning the web page to the client and is synonymous)

7. As per claim 2, Parrella teaches "generating a query from the web server to a database server" (block 65 wherein a "Super Host" and a "Web server" work together to host one or more web sites that are attached to the Internet, and replies to requests made from the Super CO Server, and performs the same function as a database server) "said database server comprising a plurality of data tables and a web page cache table" (block 65 wherein the Super Hosts holds data in single or multiple data blocks that are analogous to data tables and a web page cache table) "using said query to compare the requested web page to data contained in said web page cache data table" (block 65 wherein "the Super Host checks the web sites contained on the Web server and sends notification of any changed web pages" performs the same step and is analogous).

8. As per claim 3, Parrella teaches "examining a data field in said web cache table corresponding to said requested webpage to determine if a flag in said data field has been set to a value indicating that the version of the requested web page stored on said web server is not the most current version of said requested web page" (block 65 wherein the Super Host checks the web sites in the Web Server for any updates, checking for any updates to web pages the Super Co Server has accessed, through the Super CO Concentrator, allowing it to know when it needs to refresh its version of the

web site, and inherently performs the step of examining the data field for updates, and is synonymous).

9. As per claim 4, Parrella teaches “returning the version of said web page stored on said web server to the client if the examination of said flag in said data field indicates that the version of the web page stored on said web server is the most current version of said web page” (block 50 wherein the updated data is supplied from either the local cache, the Super CO Server, or the Super Host and is an analogous step)

10. As per claim 5, Parrella teaches “generating an updated version of said web page” (block 51 and block 62 wherein the Super CO Server requests updated copies of the changed web pages and is synonymous) “returning said updated version of said requested web page to said client” (block 65 wherein the Super Co Server sends the updated web page to the client and performs the same step as returning the updated version of the web page)

11. As per claim 6, Parrella teaches “caching said updated version of said requested web page” (block 75 wherein cache in the Super Host are kept current and updated, and caches data from a web server, and is analogous).

12. As per claim 7, Parrella teaches “setting said data flag to a value indicating a change in a web page upon execution of a database trigger” (block 65 and block 75 wherein a “refresh request” is sent from the Super CO Server to the Super Host to request data, and performs the same functions as a database trigger)

13. As per claim 8, this claim is rejected on ground corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and are similarly rejected. Additionally, Parrella teaches

"said web server further being operable to transmit said requested web page to said client upon an affirmative determination that the corresponding web page stored on said web server is the current version of said web page" (block 65 wherein "Super CO Server" transmits requested web page to client, with Super CO Server updating cached web page when it has been modified, and is a synonymous step).

14. As per claims 9-10, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 2-3.

15. As per claim 11, Parrella teaches "said database server is operable to detect the execution of a database trigger" (block 65 and block 75 wherein a "refresh request" is sent from the Super CO Server to the Super Host to request data, and performs the same functions as a database trigger)

16. As per claims 12-13, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 4-5.

17. As per claim 14, Parrella teaches "said database server is operable to update said web page cache table to set said flag to a value indicating that the version of the requested web page stored on said web server is the most current version of said requested web page" (block 64 wherein changes in data from the Web pages accessed, the Super CO Server is notified so that the caches can be updated and refreshed, and is synonymous).

18. As per claim 15, this claim is rejected on ground corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 8. Additionally, Parrella teaches "a processor; memory

Art Unit: 2168

coupled to the processor" (block 49 wherein software is held in the user and server PC's, and a processor and memory are inherently present).

19. As per claims 16-21, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 2-7.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Hunt (US 6,192,398 B1)

Wong et al (US 6,754,800 B2)

Hon et al (US 6,185,608 B1)

Maddalozzo, Jr. et al (US 5,878,218)

Gurijala et al (US 6,601,090 B1)

Swildens et al (US 6,754,699)

Holt (US 6,324,565 B1)

Carter et al (US 6,026,474).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dangelino N. Gortayo whose telephone number is (571)272-7204. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on (571)272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dangelino N. Gortayo
Examiner

*Agnieszka
Agnieszka
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100*